

Data Extraction Form

Basic Information

Article Number:

Last name (1st Author):

Journal:

Year:

Full citation:

Pubmed ID:

Reviewer Initials:

Brief Narrative Summary:

Study Details

Study Design:

Subjects (brief description):

Literacy Screening Tool:

Intervention Group Start (n):

Intervention Group End (n):

Description of Intervention:

Control Group Start (n):

Control Group End (n):

Description of Control:

Duration of Study:

Outcome #1 Keyword:

Outcome #1 Measurement Instrument:

Commented [o1]: ie, self-control (pre/post), no intervention, intervention w/o tailoring to literacy level, etc.

Outcome #1 Finding (include numbers and a brief description of the direction of the outcome):

Outcome #1 Significance: p<0.05

Outcome #2 Keyword:

Outcome #2 Measurement Instrument:

Outcome #2 Finding (include numbers and a brief description of the direction of the outcome):

Outcome #2 Significance: p<0.05

Outcome #3 Keyword:

Outcome #3 Measurement Instrument:

Outcome #3 Finding (include numbers and a brief description of the direction of the outcome):

Outcome #3 Significance: p<0.05

Outcome #4 Keyword:

Outcome #4 Measurement Instrument:

Outcome #4 Finding (include numbers and a brief description of the direction of the outcome):

Outcome #4 Significance: p<0.05

Other Important Findings:

Commented [o2]: Drop down is p<0.01, p<0.001, p<0.05, not significant

Commented [o3]: Drop down is p<0.01, p<0.001, p<0.05, not significant

Commented [o4]: Drop down is p<0.01, p<0.001, p<0.05, not significant

Commented [o5]: Drop down is p<0.01, p<0.001, p<0.05, not significant

Quality Analysis (based on Berkman et al. 2011 criteria):

Method of Randomization:

- ☐ Good- Computer generated random allocation
- ☐ Fair- Flipped coin
- ☐ Poor- Pseudo randomization (eg, days of the week) or cannot determine approach
- ☐ N/A- Participants not randomized

Allocation Concealment:

- ☐ Good- Central randomization
- ☐ Fair- Opaque envelopes
- ☐ Poor- No concealment
- ☐ N/A- Participants not randomized

Creation of Comparable Groups:

- ☐ Good- No baseline differences (>20% qualitatively) between intervention and control groups
- ☐ Fair- Few baseline differences between intervention and control groups, likely related to chance
- ☐ Poor- Multiple differences between intervention and control groups
- ☐ N/A- Participants not randomized

Maintenance of Comparable Groups:

- ☐ Good- Low attrition (<20%) and low differential loss (<5%)
- ☐ Fair- Moderate attrition (20-40%) or moderate differential loss (5-15%)
- ☐ Poor- High attrition (>40%) or high differential loss (>15%)
- ☐ N/A- Cross-sectional or case-control study

Health Literacy/Numeracy Measurement:

- ☐ Good- Measure valid and reliable (REALM, TOFHLA, WRAT or validated within study)
- ☐ Fair- Some of above features present
- ☐ Poor- None of above features present

Outcome Measurement:

- ☐ Good- Measure valid and reliable (ie mortality, clinical measure, well validated scale)
- ☐ Fair- Some of above features present (ie chart review, incompletely validated scale)
- ☐ Poor- None of above features presents (ie self-report other than pain, non-validated scale)

Outcome Measurement Equally Applied:

- ☐ Good- Same measurement applied to each group and at the same point in time
- ☐ Fair- Some of the above features present
- ☐ Poor- None of the above features present
- ☐ N/A- Study only includes one group

Blinding of patients and providers:

- ☐ Good- Blinding of both patient and providers
- ☐ Fair- Blinding of only one of the above
- ☐ Poor- No blinding
- ☐ N/A- Participants not randomized

Blinding of Outcome Assessors (to intervention/exposure status):

- ☐ Good- Yes
- ☐ Poor- No

Appropriate Statistical Testing:

- ☐ Good- Appropriate to data, accounted for clustering, multiple comparisons
- ☐ Fair- Some of the above features present
- ☐ Poor- None of the above features present

Assessment of Impact of Loss to Follow-Up:

- ☐ Good- Intent to treat or sensitivity analysis performed
- ☐ Poor- No analysis provided
- ☐ N/A- Cross-sectional, single arm, or case-control study (selected by outcome measure)

Control of Confounding:

- ☐ Good- Addressed through study design (ie randomization) and/or statistical analysis (matching, stratification, multivariate analysis, other statistical adjustment)
- ☐ Fair- Attempt made to control confounding, but doesn't address all relevant confounders
- ☐ Poor- No attempt made to control confounding

Sample Sufficient by Power Analysis:

- ☐ Good- Yes, for all outcomes reported
- ☐ Fair- Yes, for some outcomes reported
- ☐ Poor- No, not done

Overall Study Assessment:

- ☐ Good- Conclusions are very likely to be correct given degree of bias
- ☐ Fair- Conclusions are probably correct given degree of bias
- ☐ Poor- Conclusions aren't certain given degree of bias

Other General Comments:

